



## UWS Academic Portal

Sport events, space and the 'Live City'

McGillivray, David

*Published in:*

Cities: The International Journal of Urban Policy and Planning

*DOI:*

[10.1016/j.cities.2018.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.09.007)

Published: 01/02/2019

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

McGillivray, D. (2019). Sport events, space and the 'Live City'. *Cities: The International Journal of Urban Policy and Planning*, 85, 196-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.09.007>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [pure@uws.ac.uk](mailto:pure@uws.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Sport Events, Space and the ‘Live City’**

Professor David McGillivray, Chair in Event and Digital Cultures, School of Media, Culture & Society, University of the West of Scotland, Paisley Campus, High Street, Paisley, PA1 2BE

E: [david.mcgillivray@uws.ac.uk](mailto:david.mcgillivray@uws.ac.uk)

T: 00441418483032

### **Abstract**

Specially-designed, temporary festive spaces designed to accommodate spectators and visitors have become commonplace when hosting major and mega sporting events but to date they have received very little academic attention in the urban policy or planning fields. In this paper I explore the development of a ‘Live City’ concept that organisers in Glasgow operationalised during the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games. Empirically, I draw on fieldwork undertaken before, during and after the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, including documentary analysis, semi-structured interviews, and observation of the four managed Live Zones operational during the event.

Findings suggest that the concept of the Live City operationalised at G2014 represents a subtle, yet effective, means of further embedding capital accumulation processes in the urban setting. The Live City concept is reflective of a trend toward the staging of atmospheres as an urban policy tool. In effect, event visitors are welcomed to a fantasy city that only ever exists temporarily, staged for the benefit of others’ consumption. The Live City is managed and assembled to prioritise affective atmospheres, reimagining the entire city centre as a venue to be experienced, mediated and replicated in the future when other major spectacles are attracted.

Keywords: Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games; urban space; consumption; Live Zones; affective atmospheres

### **Introduction**

Major and mega sport events have received extensive academic attention in urban studies and planning in recent years (Müller, 2015; Zimbalist, 2015; Lauermann, 2015, 2016; Horne, 2015), and some of that work has considered the effects on urban space brought about or intensified by the hosting of these events (Frew & McGillivray, 2008; McGillivray & Frew, 2015; Smith, 2016; Osborn & Smith, 2016). Several researchers have directed their attention to the changing dynamics of urban public space *outside* of official sporting venues (Giulianotti & Klauser, 2011; Klauser, 2011; Hagemann, 2010). In that vein, Frew & McGillivray (2008) focused on the 2008 World Cup in Germany and emphasised the disciplinary power of the Fan Park as a quasi-privatised space that acted to contain and control the performativity of visiting soccer fans. They argued that these Fan Parks created conditions within which audiences were encouraged to participate in the production of festival narratives that generated wider media exposure, while also being under the watchful gaze of event organisers and law enforcement agencies to ensure public order was being maintained. Their work on the London 2012 Olympic Games (McGillivray & Frew 2015) drew on the theoretical lens of Deleuze and Guattari to consider how host city urban space was ‘determined’ by the demands of mega event owners. Smith (2016) and Osborn & Smith (2016) have also provided detailed analyses of the London 2012 Olympic city as a brandscape, opened up for commercial exploitation enabled by the passing of exceptional legislation required as part of the host city contract signed on award of the event.

The literature suggests that ‘Live Sites’ (Olympic Games), Fan Parks (FIFA World Cup) and their major event equivalents (e.g. Live Zones and Fan Zones) represent temporary mechanisms created by host institutional actors (in tandem with the requirements of awarding bodies) to manage the flow and circulation of visitors and residents in the event host city. These temporary mechanisms generate effects, requiring modifications to existing urban policy and regulatory mechanisms, and yet we know little about the strategic intentions behind their creation and design, or their impact on the host city during, and after, the event has moved on. The aim of this study was to examine the impact of hosting the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games (hereafter, G2014) on the flows and circulation of people within the host city, including the regulatory and legislative environments established to enable, and constrain, visitor and resident movement. Two principal research questions guided the

study: 1) to assess the strategies, tactics, and policies for event zoning in place for G2014, including the effects on the city during the event; and, 2) to explore, via observational techniques, organiser, spectator, and community members' experiences of event zones at G2014.

Structurally, the paper begins by exploring the growing body of literature around the role of sports events in facilitating, and encouraging, accelerating strategies of consumption in urban settings. I then consider the specific function of temporary event zones in shaping the spatial dynamics of the host city, with a focus on the seamless flows and circulations created in the process. Following discussion of the principal research methods employed, the study's results are presented in the form of two principal themes before some concluding comments are drawn.

### **Sport events, urban affect and capital accumulation**

A fairly significant body of literature exists which suggests that major and mega sport events are enablers of accelerated capital accumulation, with the growth coalitions that form to bid and deliver them reshaping the contours of the host city – often in an uneven fashion – to generate commercial outcomes over other development priorities (Müller, 2015; Zimbalist 2015; Stewart & Rayner, 2016). Capital accumulation is possible because, in essence, host cities operate as franchisees (Steinbrink, 2013), required by contract to deliver commercial return for the event owner and content producer – whether the International Olympic Committee (IOC), FIFA or the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF). Once they successfully win the rights to host the event, cities are then contractually obliged to implement legislative changes to enable the free flow of capital from host to event owner, with the promise that some of the benefits will trickle down to the host city in the future (Raco, 2014; Pavoni, 2015).

Temporary exceptions to existing legislative, planning and regulatory controls within the host city provide the mechanism through which external organisations extract capital from major and mega sport events (Broudehoux & Sanchez, 2015; Braathen, Mascarenhas and Sorboe, 2016). The 'partnership' (contract) between host city, awarding body and global sponsor family prioritises the production of a safe and

secure major event environment (Coaffee 2015), deterring free riders and oppositional interests so that prospective ‘customers’ are not dissuaded from occupying the festival-like, liminal (Chalip, 2017) environment created during Games-time. In other words, the event city needs to be policed and regulated, both literally and metaphorically, to ensure that potential infringements to the ‘rights’ of corporate sponsors and the awarding body’s ‘brand’ are kept to a minimum (Siddons, 2016).

Crucially, the host city bears full legal and financial responsibility for maintaining a (profitable) flow of visitors, circulating mobile capital through what Broudehoux and Sanchez (2015: 112) have called temporary “archipelagos of extraterritoriality” - urban commercial ‘zones’ placed and secured (Coaffee, 2015) in prime city centre areas to maximise visitor footfall. These spaces are invariably located in places identified as prime real estate, to exploit retail or other commercial opportunities. Major and mega events accelerate (particular) developments, skew local priorities and enable transformations to take place (quickly) in ‘problem’ areas (Paton et al, 2012; Müller, 2015; Smith, 2016). As Steinbrink (2013) suggests, this leads to “a concentration of urban policy regarding spatial distribution and content and to an acceleration of the implementation of selected (prestigious) projects” (p.131). Priority areas for real estate development are aligned to the major event zones so that when the time comes to welcome visitors - physically and via the media - the city is experienced and presented in the best possible light in order that that “commercially effective images of happiness and heroism can be sent out to the world” (Steinbrink, 2013: 130).

This generation of positive impressions aligns with the literature on affect and the urban setting, especially related to the staging of atmospheres through hosting major and mega sport events. In this literature, the city is viewed as a place to produce “heightened forms of collective sensory experience” (Gandy, 2017: 365) where feelings, emotions, and atmospheres can be managed or curated to produce powerful new urban identities. As Jamieson (2014) suggests, referring to urban festivals, “these spectacles ushered in a new emphasis upon the city as sensorium and host to a performed temporal urban identity” (p298). She contends that administrative networks in the city fetishise a festivalised urban culture and its celebration of “the image and the caption of a city *en fête*” (p299). According to the logic of the city-as-

destination, a festivalised urban culture can contribute towards positive destination image and ‘personality’ (Papadimitriou, Apostolopoulou, & Kaplanidou, 2015). The city is re-imagined as an affective entity, possessing unique characteristics that can differentiate it from its competitors. As Gandy (2017) suggests, common tactics include the use of light, advertising billboards, and other technologies of surveillance which produces a “proliferating landscape of consumption and distraction” (p368).

Bille, Bjerregaard, & Sorensen (2015) also suggest that atmospheres can be created and staged and that these processes shape the contours of public space. Like ‘urban architects’, *event architects* also seek to “shape the experience of, and emotional response to, a place through the material environment...to affect people's moods and guide their behaviour for aesthetic, artistic, utilitarian or commercial reasons” (Bille et al’s, 2015: 33). People, objects and spaces (e.g. squares, streets or parks) are organised or ‘assembled’ (Shaw, 2014) in such a way as to create “affective atmospheres” (Gandy, 2017: 255) that shape experiences, impressions and encounters. Hosting major and mega sport events represents a form of assemblage or moulding of space (Gandy, 2017) to suit the needs of awarding bodies and their sponsors seeking to occupy a central position in the event city. Temporary event venues or zones play a significant part in assembling materials, objects and people in the event city and it is to the role of these spaces that the discussion now turns.

### **Temporary Event Zones: Directing Flows and Circulations**

Over the last 15 years the host cities of consecutive major and mega sports events have advocated the creation of specially designed ‘temporary’ venues within urban civic space in tandem with their awarding bodies (McGillivray & Frew, 2015; Smith 2016). Various titles Fan Parks (FIFA World Cup), Fan Zones (European soccer Championships), Live Sites (Olympics) or public viewing areas (Schechner, 1995; Frew and McGillivray, 2008, Eick, 2010) these spaces are now part of the contractual obligations that host cities have to meet when awarded the rights to these events (Hagemann, 2010).

Originally, these temporary event spaces fulfilled a very specific containment function in the urban environment during major and mega sport events. For example,

the 2006 FIFA World Cup held in Germany was the first time to any great degree that the spectator experience of mega sports events outside official sports venues had been taken seriously (Frew & McGillivray, 2008). At that event, Fan Parks were created to host ticketless visiting football supporters and to neutralise potential fan violence by extending a warm welcome to tightly secured, festival-like, public viewing areas (Klauser, 2011). This sleight of hand by the German organisers was recognised as a success by FIFA (specifically their top tier sponsors) as they generated significant capital from access to a captive audience for marketing and promotional activities. Subsequent hosts realised the opportunities that could be exploited by marketing and promoting the presence of Fan Parks through official FIFA marketing channels. In South Africa (2010) and Rio (2014) these venues were located close to urban centres (i.e. not in unsafe locations), heavily secured and policed (barriers, bag checking, CCTV) and frequently visited by the international media to capture a ‘flavour’ of the festive event city.

The Olympic movement also identified the potential of celebration sites in the Olympic City, enshrining the provision of Live Sites in their host city contracts. McGillivray & Frew (2015) showed how the London 2012 Olympic Games created a number of temporary Live Sites and related ‘zones’ for public viewing and consumption at strategic locations in the city. Though their moniker changes depending on the awarding body their purpose and objectives remain remarkably consistent. They have moved from non-essential ‘extras’ to being considered important ‘assets’, carefully managed opportunities to facilitate liminal experiences where visiting spectators, residents and sponsors can congregate to enjoy the sporting and cultural activities on offer, beyond official sport venues. Event awarding bodies and their host city partners now view these spaces as ‘brand’ activation opportunities, where sponsors can reach large audiences; hosts can generate iconic destination imagery; and visitors can experience the host city as a continuous ‘event’.

In recent years, host cities have taken the opportunity to extend the concept of temporary non-sporting venues into the more spatially ambiguous concept of ‘zones’. While temporary venues had the same clear conditions of entry as official sport venues, there is evidence that ‘zones’ are aggregations of temporary venues more akin to festival sites, extending to a larger scale and acting as mechanisms to ‘encourage’

specific flows and circulations through the host “city as sensorium” (Jamieson, 2014). As Pavoni (2010; 2015) suggests, reconfigured as festive gatherings, they can accentuate the vibrancy of the host city, providing opportunities for corporate partners to activate their brands as well as enabling local organisers to manage the circulation and flow of spectators and visitors around the host city. Through zoning, wider swathes of the event city are then “transformed into an aestheticized place of consumption” (Jakob, 2013: 449), aligned to already-existing touristic strategies to maximise the place promotion possibilities of hosting a major sport event. For organisers and the host city place promoters, creating the idea of a city (a) live with vibrant sounds, flavours and emotions is alluring. In the remainder of this paper, attention focuses on how Glasgow, during G2014, managed its city centre spatial arrangements through the adoption of the Live City concept.

## **Methodology**

Building on the work undertaken by others into event zoning (Frew & McGillivray, McGillivray & Frew, 2015; Smith, 2016; Becker & Widholm, 2014; Pavoni, 2015), this research focuses on a second-tier sporting event, the Commonwealth Games (G2014). Though the size and scale of this event is incomparable with the two main mega events, the Olympics and the World Cup, in recent years its owner (the CGF) has sought to mimic the technical requirements of the Olympic Games, albeit on a smaller scale. Like the Olympic Games or the FIFA World Cup, G2014 required the host national government to pass the Glasgow Commonwealth Games Act (2008), which enshrined exceptional legislation relating to trading regulations and the responsibility of the host to protect the interests of Games organisers from the threat of ambush marketing. One outcome of these legislative changes was to legitimate the zoning of urban public space into discrete units, which is the empirical focus of the study.

I adopted an interpretive exploratory case study approach (Yin, 2013), utilising four data sets. First, I undertook a thematic review approach to analyse official documentation pertaining to G2014, including the bid book, the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games Act (2008), and press releases from both the organising committee and the local state officials about their plans for changes to urban space



before and during the Games (e.g. the Get Ready Glasgow initiative). Second, semi-structured interviews were conducted with three representatives involved in the planning, organising and staging of G2014 event zones, Live Zones and the 'Live City' concept. Interviews were completed with the Head of Major Events at the Destination Marketing Organisation, one G2014 Live Zones Manager and the person responsible for planning security and managing safety for the local authority during the Games.

Third, I undertook direct observation during Games-time to provide additional insights into the changing contours of urban space as the event project materialised. To ensure observations were collated in a systematic manner I made use of a research observation template which was structured using categories including: 'on route'; off route; live zones; media; corporate brandscaping; policing and regulations. Finally, I attended four Community and Resident Interest Group meetings hosted by G2014 organisers pre-Games. These events were part of the Get Ready Glasgow initiative designed to ensure the interests of residents and businesses directly affected by the hosting of the Games were being catered for when planning and delivering the event zones before and during the Games. My interest in attending these events was to assess the nature and tone of the messaging around event zones provided by organisers and their local state partners, and the audience reception to these messages. Fieldnotes were recorded on an adapted observational template. Interview transcripts, direct observations and fieldnotes from the community information events were all uploaded to a password-protected shared online space, only accessible to the author.

### **Staging the 'Live City': Exploiting Assets, Concealing Weaknesses, Enabling Circulation**

Glasgow, like many other major and mega event hosts cities, has participated in the careful management of impressions to exploit perceived strengths, while downplaying its perceived weaknesses. The Glasgow event strategy, including the development of its Live City concept for G2014, is the outcome of specific, historical and contextual variables. Since the late 1980s Glasgow has sought to use sporting, cultural and business events to promote its retail, nightlife and other visitor attractions. Second, over that period, Glasgow's civic leaders have also sought to invest resources in

revitalising city centre spaces and amending its regulatory arrangements, especially licensing, to make it easier to pursue event-related developments. This approach brought its planners, economic development agencies, tourism authorities and land service functions together. The logic of using events as a facet of urban (economic) regeneration requires strategic investment in venues, new transport infrastructures and visitor attractions located in areas identified as being most in need of improvement (Müller, 2015; Gold & Gold 2008). Event organisers, and their local state partners, carefully prepare the city for temporary display so that it conveys the right messages, and generates the most effective atmosphere (Tzanelli, 2018) to visitors and viewers alike (Steinbrink, 2013). With reference to the 2016 Olympic Games, Steinbrink (2013: 130) argues that the city needed to be prepared to generate “an optimum of international media coverage...so that commercially effective images of happiness and heroism can be sent out to the world (p.130). In Rio, this entailed the erection of visual protection screens to make the favelas ‘invisible’, alongside some investment into the beautification of those residences closest to official Games venues (Steinbrink, 2013; Haferburg & Steinbrink, 2017). Gogishvili (2018) also found this practice in Baku before the inaugural European Games with walls being built along the highways, and old buildings being clad to improve their appearance.

In the context of G2014, a number of related strategies were utilised by the Games organising committee and their local government partners to ensure that visitors experienced a festivalised culture (Jamieson, 2014) open to the creation of affective atmospheres (Gandy, 2017). First, defined areas of the city were subject to ‘deep cleansing’ and beautification, especially those ‘corridors’ marked out for special attention (see Figure 1). The deep cleansing and improvements to the civic realm, including the laying of new pavements and tree planting, was directed towards the routes between official venues, largely in the city centre area. Off-route, very little noticeable civic realm improvements were evident. The same areas that benefitted from cleaning and civic realm enhancement were also the site of the main temporary event zones, further reinforcing the visitor experience of a clean, well-tended, attractive city. As Broudehoux and Sanchez (2015) have highlighted, in planning for major sporting events, priority development areas receive significant investment to make them attractive for event visitors and to increase their real estate value, post-Games.



**Figure 1: G2014 Deep Cleansing Map**

Second, in Glasgow, the creation of a ‘Live City’ concept sought to communicate the sense that the city was literally ‘alive’, open for business and ready to welcome high-value visitors that descend on major sport events for a two-week extravaganza. As the Head of Major Events suggested, major sporting events help the city by “driving consumers”, on the basis that “we’re all about people in and images out”. Glasgow has been unique in operating a Strategic Major Events Forum (SMEF) for more than a decade. This Forum is responsible for carefully selecting events to bid for and deliver that can “generate wealth in the here and now” on the basis that “images and place messages going out help us get to the world stage and generate future benefits” (Head of Major Events). In the context of G2014 this overarching strategy was operationalised through carefully choreographed spatial management that helped ‘frame’ Glasgow’s affective place attributes for easy media consumption:

We work hard with the TV companies to make sure the image and the place that is Glasgow and the distinctive attributes are projected. And yes, sometimes it’s going to be a sanitized, polished, marketing piece that’s on there but we’re trying to make sure people can see Glasgow and think, ‘here’s a place we’d like to go and at least visit’ (Head of Major Events)

The affective domain was emphasised in the way the city was ‘experienced’ as well as presented. As the Senior Live Zone Manager suggested, Glasgow wanted to ensure visitors to G2014 experienced the city like a continuous festival:

Festival 2014 was about a Live City approach. We were trying to move away from providing a single mega event hub that everyone went to that was disconnected from everything else. So the idea was a Live City, so that anywhere you went in the city, travelling from a Games venue or through the city centre, you felt the animation of the festival

Making the city appear animated, vibrant, cosmopolitan, and aesthetically pleasing to visitors is central to Jakob’s (2013) notion of eventification. Event architects (the organisers) seek to design the material environment to shape experiences and emotional responses, often for commercial reasons. The G2014 event city was assembled to enable movement from on potential consumption zone to another. This was clearly evident in Glasgow during G2014, where the language (and logic) of commerce permeated the planning, management and success criteria for the Live City concept:

We got the *footfall* we wanted – the weather helped. It did exactly what we wanted – we got the *dwell time*, people enjoyed the food and the city felt like it was buzzing (author’s emphasis)

What we’re trying to do is maximise the business opportunities, using those urban spaces as well so that businesses are getting a hit (Head of Major Events)

The Live City arranged linked routes between satellite consumption zones, carefully integrating transit between sporting venues with opportunities for sponsor activation and exposure – integrated under the banner of its Festival 2018 branding. Transport routes, way finding signage, staff and volunteers, directed human traffic flow along specific paths. The city mapped these routes to maximise commercial opportunities (see Figure 2).



**Figure 2: City Centre Event Zones**

Along the pre-determined paths pre- and during the Games, the city was dressed in sponsor partner regalia (see Figure 3). For their ‘investment’ in sponsoring a major sport event, companies can exert significant influence over how the city looks, with existing advertising space given over to be ‘activated’, restricting the scope for local business activities to be exploited:

It depends on how much revenue they [sponsors] need to generate or the relationship they’ve got commercially with their brand determines how restrictive they are about what you can do with their brand or what you can do alongside their brand (Head of Major Events)



**Figure 3: Dressing the Event City**

Third, during G2014, the Live City concept was operationalised in the form of linked Live Zones and last mile space, strategically located in the city's parks and priority streetscapes. Within these Live Zones, major G2014 sponsors, including Virgin and Ford, employed experiential marketing techniques to attract the thousands of visitors descending on these venues or walking through the waymarked streets each day of the Games. Audiences in the Live Zone at Glasgow Green were encouraged to sprint like Usain Bolt with Virgin, and climb aboard the Ford bus to play with car simulators. Smith (2016) has commented on the increasing tendency to view public parks as commercial assets and this was evident in Glasgow in the lead up to, and during, G2014. The site of the main Live Zone, Glasgow Green, was closed off for public use for an extended period of time, pre-Games, to prepare for welcoming visitors (see Figure 4).



**Figure 4: Closed for Public Use**

While access to the Live Zones were free, organisers did, “ticket two events - the opening and closing ceremonies... to manage and secure the site and to generate a wee bit of income as well” (Senior G2014 Live Zone Manager). Within the Live Zones themselves, Games organisers were required, as part of the host city contract, to offer exclusive access to sponsors to maximise their commercial return. Again, as the G2014 Live Zones Manager suggested:

we worked in conjunction with Glasgow 2014 sponsor services because all of the sponsors as part of their package were given the choice to *activate* within the Live Zones – primarily Glasgow Green where it would work and where we had space (author emphasis)

Fourth, in order for the right impressions of the city to be communicated to visitors, the Games-time urban environment needs to be policed and surveyed (Boykoff, 2014). Others have shown how major and mega events enable a militarisation and securitisation of the public sphere whereby fences and surveillance cameras are erected to ‘secure’ the space from the threat of ambush marketing and oppositional or political messages (Boykoff, 2014; Lauermann, 2015). During G2014, Live Zones

were situated in prime city centre locations, with none located in so-called problem places (Paton et al, 2012). Instead, the zones chosen were in the City Centre (Glasgow Green), Merchant City (the archetypal gentrification zone) and the West End, one of the city's most salubrious neighbourhoods. Reinforcing the notion that these spaces were akin to formal venues, requiring securitisation, the Live Zones Senior Manager noted that:

we implemented the same security you would find at a Games venue. So more security fencing, CCTV and lights which we wouldn't ordinarily do. We would do perimeter fencing but not the same type or to the same degree.

In Glasgow, beyond Live Zones, other temporary consumption precincts were also created (Figure 5), including the Irn Bru branded shipping container where the world famous Scottish soft drink producer was able to 'activate' its brand effectively to thousands of passing visitors. Finally, Glasgow's George Square, a historical site of political struggle, was transformed into a large merchandising operation.





## **Figure 5: Sponsor activation**

This trend toward the privatisation of public space through events and entertainment is well stated by Pavoni (2017) when he suggests that cities are:

Reformulated around the needs of business and financial sectors, consumption and tourism, safety and speculation, shaped by the rhythm of privatisation, commercialisation, beautification, securitisation. In this context a novel, all-encompassing aesthetics emerges, in which security and entertainment merge and converge shaping everyday life within safe, comforting, capitalised and entertaining spaces, relations and practices (p.5)

In Glasgow, between Live Zones, defined walking routes, volunteer wayfinders and city centre cleansing processes, temporary circulatory mechanisms were created to direct visitor flows in ways that contributed to capital accumulation – though designed and assembled in as subtle a way as possible to avoid the impression that economic logic overrides visitor enjoyment of the sporting spectacle. Yet, the effect is the same - the temporary privatisation of public space, turning parks, civic squares and streetscapes into tradeable commodities for exploitation by, predominantly, external actors. Live Zones and other temporary event spaces reflect a new discursive arrangement of urban space, contributing to the reimaging of the cityscape. Though their purpose is temporary (during Games time), they operate as a Trojan Horse, where the regulatory exceptions created around major sport events enable public spaces to be offered up easily in the future for commercial exploitation. This is already evident in Glasgow where several other subsequent major event have been hosted in the city streets and parks without the need for special planning consent.

### **Spatial Inequities: What's in it for us?**

However, though events architects assemble the event city to create affective atmospheres, there is also growing evidence of disputed legacies for major and mega sporting events (Braathen et al., 2016), shining a light on the negative consequences for those excluded from the benefits. Major or mega event developments are never without consequence for residents of the event city. In terms of urban policy and

planning, the impact of major and mega event hosting is the production of unequal spatial consequences, whereby some parts of the city and portions of the population 'benefit' while others suffer (Coaffee, 2015; Gaffney, 2015). For example, there is significant evidence to suggest that the mere act of winning the rights to host a major or mega event brings about the displacement of citizens in the name of major urban infrastructural improvements. Broudehoux & Sanchez (2015) have shown how the moment Rio won the rights to host the 2016 Olympic Games exceptional legislation was enacted to bulldoze targeted favelas, with community groups impotent to resist the powerful force of the local and regional state and the contractual obligations set forth by the signing of a host city contract.

Mooney (2004) has suggested that Glasgow's event-led strategy has contributed to uneven spatial development, exacerbating the material realities of poverty and exclusion for some citizens of the city. Spatial inequities were apparent in two main forms at G2014. First, the way the event city was assembled and the need to create affective atmospheres translatable for media audiences meant that many popular civic sites were closed off to public use in the lead up to, during and for some time after the Games. Glasgow Green, Kelvingrove Park, George Square and many important travel routes operated restricted access. Smith (2016) has expressed concern at how the commercial exploitation of public assets impacts negatively on older adults, young people and those with fewer resources.

Second, observations and attendance at Community Information Events highlighted that the experience of the 'Live City' before, during and after G2014 was not viewed as an opportunity by those most directly affected by the staging of the event. Community engagement was largely tokenistic – the events were organised to inform local people about what the impact of the Games on their daily lives, including parking, temporary road closures and transport restrictions. Confirming Gaffney's (2015) view that residents and local businesses have to bow to the needs of the event, organisers reinforced a message of retime (change your plans), reroute (go a different route) and reduce (do less) during Games time, ostensibly to ensure that the flow and circulation of Games staff and visitors was unaffected.

Though the Community Information Events were largely calm and considered, in those areas most materially affected by Games-related disruptions in the city's East End, the mood was markedly different – one of anger, frustration, resentment and disappointment that the rhetoric of event-led urban regeneration had not, as promised, brought the expected material benefits. Observations from the pre-event information evening in the Dalmarnock area, at the heart of G2014's main sporting venues, highlighted real anger, relating to control and surveillance of the community. Audience responses included, "Why are these fences going up now?", and "Will that be like the border between Palestine and Israel?". The local authority bore the brunt of criticism for facilitating organisers' wishes to the detriment of the local population most affected, materially, by Games planning. There was a clear perception that organisers were 'setting the agenda', and not respecting the concerns of the local population. The forum quickly became an opportunity to express anger and dismay at the wider problems with place regeneration and associated zoning practices. Audience members directed verbal abuse at speakers, including:

I'll tell you the legacy of these Games - at the ballot box

Will you be building hospitals and a crematorium 'cause we'll need them  
because we'll all be dead

In response to local concerns about ongoing, long-term disruption, organisers responded that "long-term regeneration will bring this benefit" (e.g. retail provision in the area) and they want "the maximum number of people to benefit from the Games". However, one local resident summed up the mood of the night when he argued that:

It's all about visitors and athletes. It's not about residents. Businesses have  
been ruined. You say we're 'challenging'? The community has been shat upon.  
I thought it was going to be great but it's been all about disruption

Residents also expressed concern at being surveyed, with perimeter fencing alongside their homes and being prevented from walking in their usual areas. In response, organisers suggested perimeter fencing "protected the people working in there in a safe environment". As discussed earlier in the case of Rio 2016, the erection of visual

protection barriers, and a surveillance apparatus, to create the right aestheticised impression is common practice when hosting major and mega events, but it brings with it forms of violence – material and symbolic – that exacerbate exclusion rather than addressing it. When event architects seek to use an event like G2014 as a showcase for the city and its renaissance over the last two decades, short term impression management was always likely to be prioritised. However, post-event, unless resources (jobs, amenities, transport networks) are redirected to the areas showcased temporarily as part of the major event, then spatial inequities will be exacerbated. Festive atmospheres pass, sponsors leave, and the media moves on to the next destination.

## **Conclusions**

The concept of the Live City operationalised at G2014 represents a subtle, yet effective, means of further embedding capital accumulation processes in the urban setting. Promoted as a positive, urban space-enhancing concept, creating the Live City demands the cleansing, beautification and re-purposing of (selected) public space. As a festival-like aggregation of temporary ‘Live Zones’, waymarked routes and consumption precincts, the Live City concept sought to strategically position Glasgow as a vibrant, aesthetically pleasing and welcoming city. In its assembly, the G2014 event city was designed to direct the flow of visitors to those places inhabited by external actors paying handsomely for exclusive access to captive event audiences.

The Live City concept, and similar initiatives employed by other major event host cities, is reflective of a trend toward the staging of atmosphere as an urban policy tool. Major events like G2014 try to produce a festivalised urban culture by offering prime civic space as real estate to event architects in the hope that positive destination images and impressions are generated that are amenable to international media promotion. To enable the production of the festive event city, licensing and other regulatory functions are loosened pre-event, civic public spaces are withdrawn from public use, and the flow of visitors is re-routed to enable assets are exploited. In effect, event visitors are welcomed to a fantasy city that only ever exists temporarily, staged for the benefit of others’ consumption. The Live City is managed and assembled to prioritise affective atmospheres, reimagining the entire city centre as a

venue to be experienced, mediated and replicated in the future when other major spectacles are attracted.

Finally, despite evidence that hosting G2014 created spatial inequities within the event city, impacting on the everyday experience of residents, the allure of future returns on destination image and personality continues to override the interests of local people. Yet, with growing evidence of local opposition to the bidding for major sporting events across the West in particular, there is an opportunity for the interests of those most affected by the staging of these global spectacles to be represented at the earliest possible stage of event planning. Architects of the Live City need also to be accountable for the creation of a liveable city that ameliorates rather than exacerbates inequalities.

## References

- Bille, M., Bjerregaard, P. and Sorensen, T.F. (2015). Staging atmospheres: Materiality, culture, and the texture of the in-between, *Emotion, Space and Society*, 15, pp31-38
- Boykoff, J. (2014). *Celebration Capitalism and the Olympic Games*. London: Routledge
- Braathén, E., Mascarenhas, G., and Sorboe, C.M. (2016). A 'city of exception?' Rio de Janeiro and the disputed social legacy of the 2014 and 2016 sports mega-events. In: Viehoff V and Poynter G (eds) *Mega Event Cities: Urban Legacies of Global Sport Events*. London: Routledge, pp261-270.
- Broudehoux, A-M., and Sanchez, F. (2015). The politics of mega event planning in Rio de Janeiro: contesting the Olympic city of exception. In: Viehoff V and Poynter G (eds) *Mega Event Cities: Urban Legacies of Global Sport Events*. London: Routledge, pp109-123.
- Coaffee, J. (2015). The uneven geographies of the Olympic carceral: From exceptionalism to normalisation. *The Geographical Journal*, 181(3), pp199–211.

Frew, M, and McGillivray, D. (2008). Exploring hyper-experiences: performing the fan at Germany 2006. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 13(3), pp181-198.

Gaffney, C. (2015). Gentrifications in pre-Olympic Rio de Janeiro. *Urban Geography*, 37(8), pp1132-1153.

Giulianotti, R. and Klauser, F. (2011). Introduction: Security and Surveillance at Sport Mega Events. *Urban Studies*, 48, pp3157-3168

Gogishvili, D. (2018). Baku formula 1 city circuit: exploring temporary spaces of exception. *Cities*, 74, pp169-178

Haferburg, C. and Steinbrink, M. (2017). Mega events in emerging nations and the festivalization of the urban backstage: the cases of Brazil and South Africa. In: Hannigan, J and Richards G (eds) *The Sage Handbook of New Urban Studies*. London: Sage, pp267-294

Hagemann, A. (2010). From the stadium to the fan zone: host cities in a state of emergency. *Soccer & Society*, 11, pp723-736

Jakob, D. (2013). The eventification of place: urban development and experience consumption in Berlin and New York City. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 20(4): 447-459.

Jamieson, K (2014) Tracing festival imaginaries: Between affective urban idioms and administrative assemblages, *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17 (3), pp293-303

Klauser, F. (2011). The Exemplification of 'Fan Zones': Mediating Mechanisms in the Reproduction of Best Practices for Security and Branding at Euro 2008. *Urban Studies*, 48, pp3203-3219

Lauermann, J. (2015). Boston's Olympic bid and the evolving urban politics of event-led development. *Urban Geographies*, 37(2), pp313-321.

McGillivray, D. and Frew, M. (2015). From Fan Parks to Live Sites: mega events and the territorialisation of urban space. *Urban Studies*, 52(14), pp2649-2663.

Mooney, G. (2004). Cultural Policy as Urban Transformation? Critical Reflections on Glasgow, European City of Culture 1990, *Local Economy*, 19 (4), pp327-340

Müller, M. (2015). The mega-event syndrome: Why so much goes wrong in mega-event planning and what to do about it. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 81(1), pp6-17.

Osborn, G., and Smith, A. (2016). Olympic Brandsapes. London 2012 and the seeping commercialisation of public space. In G. Poynter et al (Eds.) *The London Olympics and Urban Development*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.139-153.

Papadimitriou, D, Apostolopoulou, A., Kaplanidou, K (2015) Destination Personality, Affective Image, and Behavioral Intentions in Domestic Urban Tourism, *Journal of Travel Research*, 54 (3), pp302-315

Paton, K., Mooney, G., and McKee, K. (2012). Class, Citizenship and Regeneration: Glasgow and the Commonwealth Games 2014, *Antipode*, 44 (4), pp1470-1489

Pavoni, A. (2010). Erasing Space from Places. Brandsapes, Art and the (de)valorisation of the Olympic Space, *Explorations in Space and Society*, 18, December 2010.

Pavoni, A. (2015). Resistant legacies. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 18(4), pp470-490.

Pavoni, A. (2017). *Controlling Urban Events*, London: Routledge

- Raco, M. (2014). Delivering Flagship Projects in an Era of Regulatory Capitalism: State-led Privatization and the London Olympics 2012. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(1), pp176–197.
- Richards, G., and Palmer, R. (2010). *Eventful cities Cultural management and urban revitalisation* Butterworth-Heinmann Oxford
- Shaw, R. (2014). Beyond night-time economy: Affective atmospheres of the urban night, *Geoforum*, 51, pp87-95
- Siddons, A. (2012). London 2012 Brand Protection – What you Need to Know. In Powell, H and Marrero-Guillamón, I. (eds) *The Art of Dissent. Adventures in London's Olympic State*. London: Marshgate.
- Smith, A. (2016). *Events in the City: Using Public Spaces as Event Venues*. London: Routledge.
- Steinbrink, M. (2013). Festifavelisation: mega events, slums and strategic city-staging – the example of Rio de Janeiro, *Die Erde*, 144 (2), pp129-145
- Stewart, A., and Rayner, S. (2016). Planning mega-event legacies: uncomfortable knowledge for host cities. *Planning Perspectives*, 31(2), pp157-179.
- Tzanelli, R. (2018). *Mega-Events as Economies of the Imagination: Creating Atmospheres for Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020*, London: Routledge
- Yin, R (2013). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th ed. Sage Publication. London.
- Zimbalist, A. (2015). *Circus Maximus: The Economic Gamble Behind Hosting the Olympics and the World Cup*. Washington: Brookings